

Remarks

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejection and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 4 and 6-8 have been rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hino (US 7,237,029) in view of Mori (US 7,228,061) and Aoki (7,417,680).

Claims 1 and 4 have been amended so as to further distinguish the present invention, as recited therein, from the references relied upon in the rejection. It is submitted that the claims are patentable over the references for the following reasons.

Claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Hino, Mori and Aoki, since claim 1 recites an apparatus including, in part, a TV receiver operable to display at least one image from a recording medium, and a remote controller operable to control the TV receiver,

wherein the TV receiver comprises a first controller for transmitting a display image list, based on image information from the recording medium, and image data of images stored in the recording medium to the remote controller,

wherein the remote controller obtains the image data of the recording medium from the TV receiver when receiving the display image list from the TV receiver,

wherein the remote controller displays a plurality of images on a second display part of the remote controller simultaneously or sequentially, the plurality of images from the image data that is decoded in the remote controller,

wherein the remote controller transmits a command to the TV receiver, when one or more images from the plurality of images displayed on the second display part is selected,

wherein the TV receiver displays the one or more images in full screen mode on a first display part of the TV receiver when receiving the command from the remote controller,

wherein the second display part is operable to display the one or more images as a two-dimensional array of thumbnail images, in which a first axis of the two-dimensional array represents a time period, and

wherein the second display part is prevented from displaying for a time period when no image from the time period exists in the recording medium.

The combination of Hino, Mori and Aoki fails to disclose or suggest any of these features of claim 1.

Hino discloses a system that allows for the remote control of home appliances 31 and 32. The system includes a home network 30 to which the home appliances 31 and 32 are connected, an outside network 50 and/or a control device 60, and a gateway (GW) apparatus 10 that controls the communication between the home network 30 and the outside network 50 and/or the control device 60. When an outside request (from the outside network 50 or control device 60) is received by the GW apparatus 10 about a particular appliance, the GW apparatus 10 sends back appliance panel information about the appliance to the requestor. The appliance panel information can include a graphical user interface (GUI) illustrating panel parts which are present on the actual control panel of the appliance. (See column 7, line 53 – column 8, line 11).

Once the appliance panel information has been received by the requestor, the requestor can control the appliance by using the GUI associated with the appliance. When the requestor issues a control command for the appliance, the control command is received by the GW apparatus 10. The GW apparatus 10 then determines whether or not the control command is acceptable, and if so, the GW apparatus 10 issues the control command to the appliance via the home network 30. (See column 8, lines 12-67).

In the rejection, the device used by the requestor (e.g., the control device 60 or the device that utilizes the outside network 50) is relied upon as corresponding to the claimed remote controller. Regarding this, it is noted that Hino does disclose that the requestor device receives information to reproduce a GUI that illustrates the control panel parts associated with the selected appliance. Further, Hino also discloses that the appliances 31 and 32 can include AV devices (see column 6, lines 65-66). However, the reception of information associated with the control panel of an AV device by the requestor device and the display of the control panel of the AV device as a GUI on the requestor device are completely different than obtaining, in a remote controller, image data of a recording medium from the TV receiver (i.e., an AV device) when receiving the display image list from the TV receiver and displaying, by the remote controller, a plurality of images from the image data which is decoded in the remote controller. Therefore, it is apparent that Hino fails to disclose or suggest any of the above features recited in claim 1. As a result, Mori and/or Aoki must disclose or suggest these features in order for the combination of references to render claim 1 obvious.

Regarding Mori, it discloses an image display system whereby related video data from a number of different sources can be integrated in a temporal manner. The system includes a TV

apparatus 1 that is capable of receiving video data from a number of different sources and a remote control 2 that is capable of controlling the display of the video data from the sources on the TV apparatus 1. (See Figures 2 and 3).

When both a video camera (DVC) 3 and a memory card 6 from a digital camera 5 are connected to the TV apparatus 1 and any video data stored thereon overlaps temporally, the TV apparatus 1 automatically displays a “tied string icon” on the screen. When this icon is selected using the remote control 2, the TV apparatus 1 displays the video data from both sources on the screen simultaneously with the video data recorded at the same time from the two different video sources being linked. For video data from each of the sources that does not correspond time-wise with video data from the other source, this video data is not linked with video data from the other source and that portion of the screen is left blank. (See column 18, line 48 - column 19, line 46 and Figure 20).

Based on the above discussion, it is apparent that the remote control 2 is capable of selecting between various icons displayed on the screen of the TV apparatus 1, and that the selection varies what video data is displayed on the screen of the TV apparatus 1. Further, it is apparent that Mori discloses that the remote control 2 includes a display section 255 that shows screens for menu operations, date and time, and information data transmitted from the TV apparatus 1 (see column 14, line 65 – column 17, line 3 and Figures 3 and 4). However, there is absolutely no disclosure or suggestion in Mori that the remote control 2 obtains image data of a recording medium from the TV apparatus 1 when receiving a display image list from the TV apparatus 1 and displays a plurality of images from the image data which is decoded in the remote control 2. Therefore, Mori fails to disclose or suggest any of the above features recited in claim 1. As a result, Aoki must disclose or suggest these features in order for the combination of references to render claim 1 obvious.

As for Aoki, it is relied upon in the rejection as disclosing a two-dimensional array of thumbnail videos. However, it is submitted that Aoki fails to address the above-noted deficiencies of Hino and Mori. As a result, claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Hino, Mori and Aoki.

Regarding claim 4, it is patentable over the combination of Hino, Mori and Aoki for reasons similar to those set forth above in support of claim 1.

Because of the above-mentioned distinctions, it is believed clear that claims 1, 3, 4 and 6-8 are not allowable over the references relied upon in the rejection. Furthermore, it is submitted that the distinctions are such that a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would not have been motivated to make any combination of the references of record in such a manner as to result in, or otherwise render obvious, the present invention as recited in claims 1, 3, 4 and 6-8. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 1, 3, 4 and 6-8 are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that there are issues remaining which must be resolved before allowance of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Takeshi HAYAKAWA

/David M. Ovedovitz/

By 2010.02.16 12:51:40 -05'00'

David M. Ovedovitz
Registration No. 45,336
Attorney for Applicant

DMO/jmj
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
February 16, 2010